

VZCZCXRO6405
RR RUEHAG RUEHDF RUEHLZ
DE RUEHRL #2008/01 3061106
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
R 021106Z NOV 07
FM AMEMBASSY BERLIN
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 9678
RHMFIUU/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC
INFO RUCNFRG/FRG COLLECTIVE
RUEHSW/AMEMBASSY BERN 0770
RUEHBS/AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS 0121
RUEHCP/AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN 0468
RUEHDL/AMEMBASSY DUBLIN 0199
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV 0012
RUEHLO/AMEMBASSY LONDON 8615
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW 1862
RUEHNY/AMEMBASSY OSLO 0399
RUEHOT/AMEMBASSY OTTAWA 1084
RUEHFR/AMEMBASSY PARIS 9162
RUEHPG/AMEMBASSY PRAGUE 0464
RUEHRO/AMEMBASSY ROME 0811
RUEHSM/AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM 0411
RUEHTC/AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE 1153
RUEHKO/AMEMBASSY TOKYO 1524
RUEHBS/USEU BRUSSELS
RUEHUNV/USMISSION UNVIE VIENNA 0303

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 04 BERLIN 002008

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE

SIPDIS

STATE FOR EUR, ISN, WHA, AND EAP
DOE FOR NNSA

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [ETTC](#) [KNNP](#) [CBW](#) [TRGY](#) [GM](#) [JA](#) [RS](#)

SUBJECT: OCTOBER 30 G-8 GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP MEETING FOCUSES
ON GEOGRAPHIC EXPANSION AND MODALITIES

11. (SBU) SUMMARY: The final G-8 Global Partnership Working Group (GPWG) meeting of the German G-8 Presidency took place in Berlin on October 30, and included focused discussions on geographic expansion and related modalities. The delegates also heard presentations from implementing agencies describing progress on specific Global Partnership (GP) projects and from donor countries on related bilateral initiatives. Japan tabled a draft Plan of Work for the GPWG under the 2008 Japanese Presidency and provided dates for the 2008 G-8 Nonproliferation Directors Group (NPDG) and GPWG meetings in Japan. The delegates reached broad agreement on the need for geographic expansion, but further discussion on the modalities thereof will continue under the Japanese presidency. Germany proposed possible mechanisms for moving forward on expansion, including the integration of existing and future bilateral projects into the GP scope of work, endorsement of new recipient countries by the GPWG itself, and high-level endorsement at future G-8 Summits.

12. (SBU) SUMMARY CONTINUED: Delegates from Canada, France, the UK, Italy, the EU Commission, Japan, and the United States expressed support for expansion and pledged to honor existing GP commitments to Russia and other former Soviet Union (FSU) countries. While agreeing in principle to the need for geographic expansion, Russia proposed a formal, highly structured selection process and admission procedure. ISN DAS Andrew Semmel, who headed the U.S. delegation, pointed to the role GP expansion and extension could play in countering new and emerging threats. Semmel suggested admission should be driven by necessity and threat and expressed concern about creating an overly formalized mechanism for admitting new recipient countries. The UK argued that future expansion should be based on clearly identified needs, should add value to the GP, and should be consistent with priorities and objectives identified at the

Kananaskis Summit in 2002. The Japanese delegation cited the need to assess what projects GP countries are currently undertaking outside of Russia and the FSU. Japanese head of delegation Yasunari Morino indicated strong interest in close discussion with the United States on how to move GP expansion forward. END SUMMARY.

13. (SBU) German Commissioner for International Energy Policy Viktor Elbing and Thomas Meister, Director of the German MFA's International Energy and Nuclear Energy Policy and Nuclear Nonproliferation Division co-chaired an October 30 meeting of G-8 and other donor nations to discuss the Global Partnership's (GP) geographic scope, as well as possible modalities and geographic focus of future expansion. In an effort to spur discussion, the German chair put forward three ideas for admitting new recipient states: bilateral initiatives, GPWG endorsement, and high-level endorsement at the G-8 Summit. Under the bilateral procedure, each country would define the scope of its own bilateral cooperation programs and report to the GPWG. Under the second option, a group of donor countries could recommend a new recipient country to the GPWG for endorsement. The third option gives the GPWG the option to seek high-level endorsement of new recipients by heads of state and government at the annual G-8 Summit.

14. (SBU) Canadian delegate Troy Lulashnyk reiterated Canadian support for expanding the geographic scope of the GP, focusing on the importance of modalities. Lulashnyk suggested the GPWG should build and accelerate the work of the GP. He noted G-8 partners had agreed to expansion previously at both Sea Island (2004) and Heiligendamm (2007). It is not a question of whether the GP expands but, rather,

BERLIN 00002008 002 OF 004

when and by what modalities. Lulashnyk reaffirmed Canada's position that the GP needs to expand to respond to emerging global threats, but offered assurances to the Russian delegation that Canada and other countries remain committed to fulfilling the core GP objectives vis-a-vis Russia and the FSU.

Russia Cautiously Endorses Expansion

15. (SBU) Russian delegate Oleg Rozhkov said Russia agreed in principle with geographic expansion. He suggested future expansion should be modeled on the procedures followed in 2004 when Ukraine joined the GP as a recipient state. As in the case of Ukraine, Rozhkov explained, the GP should undertake a formal confirmation process that would require a new recipient state to formally apply and to subscribe to the Kananaskis principles. Rozhkov discouraged "expansion for expansion's sake," noting that Russia does not believe all countries possess the proliferation/terrorism nexus described in the Kananaskis principles. Rozhkov resisted the idea of including partners' bilateral projects outside of Russia and the FSU under the auspices of the GP. He emphasized the GP is a practical instrument for implementation and cooperation with dedicated funding, established agreements, and identifiable, tangible outcomes. Rozhkov questioned whether GP donors have sufficient funds and human resources to carry out expansion activities. He concluded by endorsing geographic expansion but stressed it should be done on a case-by-case basis, beginning with a review of the 2004 applications from other FSU states, specifically Kazakhstan.

Expansion Necessary to Confront Emerging Threats

16. (SBU) DAS Semmel highlighted the success of the GP and stressed the need to accelerate efforts inside and outside Russia and the FSU. Semmel reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to Russia to finish work started under Kananaskis but emphasized

the importance of expanding the geographic scope of the GP and extending the partnership beyond 2012. Turning to modalities for expansion, Semmel stated the U.S. preference for flexible admissions procedures rather than a formal admission process. In order to preserve the GP's flexibility to react to emerging threats, admission criteria and decisions should be driven by ongoing assessments of needs and threats. Semmel stated the U.S. will continue its bilateral threat reduction activities outside Russia and the FSU and reiterated the need to keep the GP expansion process as flexible as possible in order to facilitate admission and to address new and emerging threats, rather than make it more difficult. DAS Semmel also briefed the GPWG plenary (G-8, all donor countries, and international organizations) on U.S. threat reduction programs and activities outside Russia and the former Soviet Union. The briefing placed special emphasis on the Biosecurity Engagement Program (BEP) and the Nuclear Smuggling Outreach Initiative (NSOI).

¶7. (SBU) UK Delegate Nick Low reaffirmed his government's commitment to finishing projects in Russia under the Kananaskis objectives. On modalities for expansion, Low suggested three criteria for identifying additional beneficiary countries: (1) the existence of a clear need and/or threat; (2) new undertakings must add value to the GP's capacity to address that threat; and, (3) new undertakings must be coherent and consistent with Kananaskis

BERLIN 00002008 003 OF 004

objectives. Low expressed confidence that the GP would be able to successfully integrate additional recipient countries and to confront new challenges. He also assured Russia that any geographic expansion would not undermine the UK's work in Russia and the FSU. Low also presented the UK's "Inter-Governmental Threat Reduction Model Agreement" as a potentially useful tool for GP donors and recipients to use to expedite and simplify the negotiation of implementation agreements. Low stated the Model Agreement could be a resource for other future recipient countries to see what provisions a donor nation might expect, particularly in the areas of taxes and liability, but stressed that the UK will not seek to have the Model Agreement officially endorsed by the GPWG.

¶8. (SBU) Italian delegate Antonio di Melilli suggested the GPWG revisit the 2004 process used to bring Ukraine in as a beneficiary. French delegate Jean-Hugues Simon-Michel said France supports geographic expansion but was ambivalent about which specific countries should be targeted. He suggested geographic expansion could focus on nuclear safety and security.

¶9. (SBU) European Commission delegate Bruno Dupre lauded the GPWG as an excellent coordination mechanism and reaffirmed the EC's commitment to activities in Russia under the EU's TACIS program. Dupre also explained that the EU is undertaking additional projects outside Russia and the FSU under the auspices of an (unspecified) EU Joint Action to address issues related to export controls, biological safety and security, and combating illicit trafficking in WMD materials.

Japan Unveils Draft Work Plan for 2008

¶10. (SBU) Japanese delegate Yasunari Morino stated the issue of expansion has been under GPWG consideration since Kananaskis. He asked the group to share information about bilateral and other activities currently underway outside Russia and the FSU and to consider what more could or should be done. At the conclusion of the meeting, Morino circulated a draft plan of work for the 2008 Japanese G-8 Presidency. He stated the focus would be on how to move forward on geographic expansion by broadening the GP mandate to include "promoting existing multilateral instruments" such as UNSCR

1540, safeguards and the Additional Protocol, the UN Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials (CPPNM), and others.

¶11. (SBU) In response to the plan of work, Russian delegate Rozhkov asked whether Japan will try to reach a decision on expansion and extension by the June 2008 G-8 Summit. Morino was non-committal, suggested that Japan will seek maximum progress but such a decision would be driven by how discussions at future GPWG meetings develop. The Japanese delegation also announced a provisional schedule for the GPWG and NPDG meetings under the Japanese Presidency in 2008. GPWG dates are as follows: January 30 (G-8 only); February 26 (G-8 plus non-G-8 partners) and February 27 (G8 only); April 23 (G-8 only). All GPWG meetings will be held in Tokyo. NPDG dates are as follows: January 31; February 28; March 37; April 24; and June 5. All NPDG meetings will be held in Tokyo except for June 5, which will take place at a location to be determined.

BERLIN 00002008 004 OF 004

Sidebar Consultations with Japan

¶12. (SBU) In a meeting with the U.S. delegation before the GPWG, Morino solicited U.S. input on the Global Partnership for 2008 and expressed concern about Russian opposition to expansion. Morino did not propose a new initiative separate from the GP. (NOTE: Japanese Embassy officials in Washington had raised the idea several times in earlier bilateral meetings. END NOTE.) Nonetheless, Semmel conveyed U.S. concerns on a separate initiative outside the GP, citing "initiative fatigue," countries' potential difficulties securing additional funding, and the amount of time required to formulate a framework and have it endorsed at high levels. Morino indicated the Japanese delegation would meet with the Russian delegation to discuss Japanese plans to distribute a questionnaire to GPWG members on current bilateral projects outside Russia and the FSU, as well as what possible future non-Russia/FSU GP projects they may be willing to undertake. Semmel suggested that the Japanese inform the Russians of their intent to distribute a questionnaire, rather than seeking Russian approval. (NOTE: Morino approached Semmel on the margins of the GPWG and indicated he had followed this advice and simply informed the Russian about the questionnaire. END NOTE.)

¶13. (SBU) In a follow-on meeting after the GPWG, Morino indicated Japan is extremely interested in U.S. ideas on GP for 2008 and wants to continue close discussions. Morino seemed more positive about the possibility of containing Russian opposition to expansion following Russian statements on the subject during the plenary. Japan's concerns about Russian opposition were assuaged after Russia did not object to Japan's plans to circulate a questionnaire on WMD threat reduction activities outside of Russia and the FSU. Morino would not be drawn out on Japan's position on a separate G-8 initiative focusing on Asia but seemed to be heading away from the idea of a separate initiative given less-than-anticipated Russian opposition. Semmel and Morino discussed possible mechanisms for expanding the geographic scope of the GP. Semmel stressed that expansion should be flexible and encourage the broadest participation of new recipients and donors. Morino concurred with this position but noted the formal admission process used for Ukraine's admittance would be an obstacle to overcome in the coming year.

¶14. (U) DAS Semmel has cleared this cable.

TIMKEN JR